

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the in-person interview granted on September 22, 2010. During the interview independent claims 48 and 67 were discussed in light of the prior art of record.

The above amendments have been made to further clarify and define Applicants' invention and to expedite the present application to allowance.

The amendment is submitted with a request for a 1 month extension of time.

Upon entry of the present amendment claims 48-50, 52, 59-61, 65, 67-68 and 114 will be pending, of which claims 48, 67, and 114 are independent.

The Examiner has rejected claims 67 and 69 under 35 USC 112 for failing to comply with the written description requirement because the claims contain terminology that Examiner asserts is not described in the specification. Applicants respectfully disagree. However, to expedite prosecution and to further clarify and define Applicants' invention, Applicants have amended claim 67 using new terminology consistent with the specification and Fig 3A and Fig. 3B. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claims 67 and 68 under 35 USC 112 as set forth on page 2 of the FOA.

The Examiner has rejected claims 48, 49, 50, 52, 59-61, 63, 65-68 and 114 under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in light of US Patent 6,163,716 to Edwards et al taken in view of US Patent 5,797,903 to Swanson and US Patent 5,156,151 to Imran. Applicants have amended independent claims 48, 67 and 114 to further define and set forth the novel features of Applicants' invention. In light of Applicants' amendments, the Examiner's rejection under 35 USC 103 is now moot. More specifically, Edwards in view of Swanson and Imran does not teach nor suggest the use of a conductor that carries both power and data as set forth in independent claims 48 and 114. Support for the function of power and data on the same conductor can be found in the specification at least on page 13 paragraph 44, wherein the functions of ground, power and data are

discussed in light of two conductors. Furthermore, Edwards in view of Swanson and Imran does not teach nor suggest electrodes of an effector positioned about the microprocessor of the same effector as set forth in independent claims 67 and 114. Thus, the combined reading of the prior art fails to suggest or teach Applicants' claimed invention as set forth in independent claims 48, 67, and 114. Applicants assert that independent claims 48 and 67 are not made obvious by Edwards in view of Swanson and Imran, taken alone or in combination as suggested by the Examiner. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of Examiner's rejection of independent claims 48, 67, and 114 as set forth on Page 3-5 of the FOA and full allowance of same.

Claims 49, 50, 52, 59-61, and 65 depend from and further limit independent claim 48. Thus, claims 49, 50, 52, 59-61, and 65 are also in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of Examiner's rejection of claims 49, 50, 52, 59-61, and 65 as set forth on page 3-5 of the FOA and full allowance of same.

Claim 68 depends from and further limits independent claim 67. Thus, claim 68 is also in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of Examiner's rejection of claim 68 as set forth on page 5 of the FOA and allowance of same is requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully request passing this application to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Sept 29, 2010

By: /Jubin Dana/
Jubin Dana
Reg. No. 41,400